



Needs Assessment Committee

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, February 3, 2005

160 N. Main Street, Mayor's Conference Room, 8th Floor

Executive Committee
Scott Fleming, Chairman
Nick Clark, Vice-Chairman
Cato Johnson, Vice-Chairman
Nisha Powers, Secretary

Committee Members
David Lillard, Commissioner
Deidre Malone, Commissioner
Dr. Thomas Glass
Audrey Howard
David Pickler
Patrice Robinson
Jay Weatherington

Shelby County Government
A C Wharton, Jr., Mayor

Committee members present:

Scott Fleming, Chairman	Dr. Thomas Glass
Nick Clark, Vice-Chairman	Commissioner David Lillard
Cato Johnson, Vice-Chairman	David Pickler
Nisha Powers, Secretary	Patrice Robinson
	Jay Weatherington

Committee members absent:

Commissioner Deidre Malone
Wanda Halbert
Audrey Howard

School personnel present:

Dr. Bobby Webb, Superintendent, SCS
Dr. Richard Holden, Assistant Superintendent, SCS
Mrs. Maura Sullivan, Director of Research and Planning, SCS
Ron Lollar, Shelby County Board of Education Member
Lavon Alston, Chief Operations Officer, MCS
Tom Marshall, MCS Consultant
Deni Hirsh, Memphis Board of Education Member

Shelby County Administration and Staff:

John Fowlkes, CAO
Kevin Gallagher, Mayor's Office, Public Affairs
Grace Hutchinson, Deputy Director, Finance and Administration
Marion Jones, Senior Planner, Memphis and Shelby County DPD

Visitors present:

Dr. Susan Roakes, U of M, Dept. of City and Regional Planning
Channel 5

Chairman Fleming called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m.

Chairman Fleming welcomed everyone and thanked them for coming.

Old Business

Approval of the January 21, 2004 Meeting Minutes was deferred until the March 8, 2005 Meeting.

ACTION: Mrs. Powers will proof minutes and e-mail them before the March 8, 2005 meeting.

Mr. Marshall requested an agenda be made available prior to the meeting.

ACTION: Chairman Fleming committed to making the agenda available prior to the meeting.

Review of tasks as outlined in the resolution: Chairman Fleming passed out a copy of the County Commission resolution establishing the NAC and setting forth its work/mission. Each task was reviewed and discussed.

ACTION: NAC members agreed the Committee was making progress to respond to and fulfill the tasks outlined in the resolution.

Review of square foot needs per student for new construction (January 13, 2005):

The Committee reviewed the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations regarding new construction square footage needs for students. Dr. Glass presented his square footage recommendations (Memorandum to Scott Fleming dated February 3, 2005). Dr. Glass broke out each school division into sub-categories and discussed each sub-category. Dr. Glass' numbers are largely driven by program needs and are accurate if space is efficiently utilized. Dr. Glass cautioned the ASU numbers can be deceptive. Commissioner Lillard felt there was a wide range in square feet, particularly as it relates to high schools (31.5% difference in square footage range). Commissioner Lillard asked how these numbers compared to recent new construction and the City/County school population. Commissioner Lillard felt the square footage range needs to be closer for capital funding purposes, particularly in the reserve area as an example.

Commissioner Lillard stated that the school systems should report on actual enrollment rather than building capacity. Commissioner Lillard felt school data should reflect actual enrollment that includes students in portable classrooms and the building capacity necessary to meet the gap currently filled by the portable classrooms. The additional building capacity necessary to meet the actual enrollment based on demographic trend information is translated into a fiscal note that identifies the capital expenditure required to meet the gap. The fiscal note value would be determined by multiplying the additional square footage needed per student by the cost per square foot. The purpose of the study is to identify the gap.

There appears to be agreement that special education will be exempted from the square footage range based on the special needs and special programs for this particular population.

Tom Marshall passed out two documents during the discussion:

1. "Best Practices Data/ Comparative Analysis"- Corrections for Shelby County Schools square footage requirements (150 sq.ft for high schools, 100 sq.ft. for middle schools and 110 sq.ft. for elementary schools). NAC Members appreciated Mr. Marshall's work in preparing this document.
2. "Programming Circulation Factors in K-12 Facilities/CEFPI Presentation"

ACTION: Tom Marshall was asked to take Dr. Glass' information contained in the Memo to Scott Fleming dated February 3, 2005 and update his chart titled "Best Practices Data/Comparative Analysis".

New Business

Proposed cost per square foot for new construction: This point was discussed as part of the larger discussion of Review of square foot needs per student for new construction (January 13, 2005) under Old Business. Bonds could be sold as needed or possibly use capital anticipation notes/commercial paper funds.

ACTION: Tom Marshall and Dr. Richard Holden were asked to meet and update new construction costs. These costs did not previously include A & E fees, land acquisition, inflation index, etc.

655 School Agreement: Vice-Chairman Nick Clark asked Grace Hutchinson if FY 05-06 was the last year for the 655 funds. Mrs. Hutchinson said it was. Mrs. Hutchinson stated that these expenditures were treated as special funds for the school boards to allocate as each school board deemed appropriate. Under the agreement, Memphis City Schools will receive \$57.3 million and Shelby County Schools will receive \$20 million for a total Shelby County Government allocation of \$77.3 million for FY 05-06.

Review of Summary of Prioritized Capital Expenditures: The discussion revolved around four documents passed out by the Executive Committee:

1. Summary of Prioritized Capital Expenditures Needs dated 1/31/2005 in the bottom right hand corner (larger type).
2. Summary of Prioritized Capital Needs dated 2/2/2005 in the lower bottom right hand corner (smaller type).
3. Needs Assessment Committee, Capital Expenditure Requests-February 2005, as Submitted by MCS & SCS.
4. Needs Assessment Committee, Capital Expenditure Requests-February 2005, NP's Proposed Alternate.

MCS ADA Priorities: Secretary Nisha Powers inquired about the specifics regarding ADA compliance and deadlines.

Tom Marshall explained a letter of non-compliance is a part of a process. Dr. Kreigel from the State conducted an audit last week and will issue a report in 30 days. Mr. Marshall also stated that all schools must comply with ADA standards regardless of whether there is a handicapped population; otherwise, it is construed that the school system is limiting a student's freedom to choose. MCS is attempting to negotiate a two (2) year period in which to provide the improvements. Mrs. Powers asked when the 2 year period began. Mr. Marshall stated that it began when funding was approved.

Commissioner Deni Hirsh cautioned against violating legal mandates because you lose public trust. She did not feel the school system could afford to lose the public's trust with respect to providing a safe environment. She also stated deferred maintenance is how MCS got in its current condition. Repairs are not dealt with until they become an emergency. Mr. Marshall stated BOMA is a five (5) year cycle rather than a three (3) year cycle. BOMA identifies components individually and assigns dates using a facility conditions index.

Commissioner Lillard suggested doing a blanket bond for small projects that could better enable minority participation. This approach could permit the work to occur in a more timely fashion than

bidding out one larger contract or several large contracts and increase the bid pool. Dr. Holden added that SCS deferred the majority of its maintenance projects until next year even though it was longer than SCS would have preferred.

It was suggested that new construction projects could be divided in to two years, with Year 1 including acquisition and year two would be construction. Renovation was also suggested for a two year funding cycle. Various types of renovation costs were discussed.

ACTIONS:

- 1. Tom Marshall was asked to provide ADA costs in today's prices and to provide an inflation index if all the improvements were not funded or if some projects were spread out over a 2- 4 year period.**
- 2. Both school systems were asked to identify and justify each expenditure in order to tighten up the report so it is more defensible.**
- 3. Secretary Nisha Powers agreed to add years onto the Needs Assessment Committee, Capital Expenditure Requests-February 2005, NP's Proposed Alternate prior to the next meeting and to work with MCS representatives.**
- 4. The Executive Committee pledged to meet with each school system to discuss priorities.**

Review Outline of Preliminary Report Format: A copy of the preliminary report format was distributed.

Review proposed Timeline (January 31, 2005): A copy of the proposed timeline was distributed. Commissioner Lillard inquired if there would be public meetings and a County Commission briefing. Chairman Fleming said there would be.

Other Business

The next meeting will be Tuesday, March 8, 2005 at 8:30 A.M. in the Mayor's Large Conference Room, 160 North Main Street, Suite 850.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 A.M.

Meeting Summary

- The next NAC Meeting will be Tuesday, March 8, 2005 at 8:30 A.M. in the Mayor's Large Conference Room, 160 North Main Street, Suite 850.
- NAC will take action on January 21 and February 3, 2005 Meeting Minutes.
- January 21, 2005 Meeting Minutes and Agenda for March 8, 2005 Meeting will be e-mailed before the March 8, 2005 NAC Meeting.
- NAC Members agreed the Committee is meeting its goals/mission. The Committee agreed to a preliminary report outline and time schedule developed by the Executive Committee.
- The Executive Committee agreed to make changes to the draft documents and to meet with each school system to discuss funding priorities.
- Tom Marshall was asked to do the following:
 - 1) Take Dr. Glass' information contained in the Memo to Scott Fleming dated February 3, 2005 and update chart titled "Best Practices Data /Comparative Analysis"
 - 2) Provide ADA costs in today's prices and to provide an inflation index if all the improvements were not funded or if some projects were spread over a 2-4 year period.

- Tom Marshall and Dr. Richard Holden were asked to meet and update new construction costs. These costs did not previously include A&E fees, land acquisition, inflation index, etc.
- Both school systems were asked to identify and justify each expenditure in order to tighten up the report so it is more defensible.

Respectfully submitted,

Nisha Powers
Secretary

Date